THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

July 7, 1981

AM
9:00 I. SITE INSPECTION

A. Vietnam Veterans Memorial; site inspection, Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, N.W.

B. Old Post Office; site inspection, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

C. Marriott/Quadrangle brick sample inspection, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (S.L. 81-18) Square 254.

10:00

CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

II. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of May 12, 1981 minutes of the Commission of Fine Arts.

B. Dates of next meetings: September 16, 1981 (Wednesday)
October 13, 1981

C. Public hearing on Georgetown Harbour Associates project at 3020 K Street, N.W. (O.G. 81-87, HPA. 81-244); report.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 7/JUL/81 - 1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial; preliminary design review, Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, N.W.

B. General Services Administration

1. CFA 7/JUL/81 - 2, Old Post Office renovation; final landscaping and paving plan, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 7/JUL/81 - 3, Intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue, restudy of curb alignment and preliminary designs.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS CONTINUED

D. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 7/JUL/81 - 4, Renwick Gallery; resurfacing of ornamental stonework. 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

E. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 81-52, 601 24th Street, N.W. Preliminary design; new apartment building.

b. S.L. 81-53, 2112 F Street, N.W. Revised preliminary designs; new apartment building.

c. S.L. 81-55, 655 15th Street, N.W. Final working drawings for office/retail complex.

d. S.L. 81-56, 2613 Klingle Road, N.W. Preliminary design for new residence.

e. S.L. 81-59, 1301 E Street, N.W. Proposed signs for new office building.

f. S.L. 81-63, 55 Ivy Street, S.E. Working drawings; new office building.

g. S.L. 81-66, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Preliminary design and material selection.

h. Appendix I

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 81-129, 1732 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.; raze retail building.

b. O.G. 81-133, 3000 M Street, N.W.; canopy designs.

c. Appendix II

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

July 7, 1981

	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
..81-22	600 Maryland Avenue, N.W. Boston Properties	Install one single faced 20'x 1'6" and one double faced 2'- 6" x 3'- 2" internally lighted stencil cut aluminum face display with plexiglass letters internally lighted with fluorescent lamps.

TION: Issue permit

L. 81-35	2108 F Street, N.W. Diana J.R. Brockendorf	10 story above grade apartment building with 1 below grade level professional offices and 2 below grade levels parking spaces.

TION: Case returned to D.C. Permits Branch awaiting Zoning approval before Commission view.

L. 81-42	1749 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Oliver T. Carr Co.	Erect 1 internally lighted wall sign 18" x 16', aluminum (bronze color) field, white plex copy.

TION: Issue permit for sign to match size and materials of adjacent signs.

.L. 81-43 ?A. 81-308	1401 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Willard Associates	Restore and renovate the Willard Hotel and build a new addition.

CTION: Final working drawings were submitted and approved. Issue permit. Detailed esigns for alterations and additions are approved. Request samples of terra-cotta and rick to be used on new wing for review and approval prior to construction of these lements.

.L. 81-44	2217 N Street, N.W. 2217 N Street Corp.	New building.

ACTION: Issue permit.

.L. 81-45	555 4th Street, N.W. Rozansky & Kay Construction Co.	New 11 floor office building, limestone.

CTION: See letter from J. Carter Brown to Robert L. Moore, dated May 28, 1981.

---

viewed previously by the Commission of Fine Arts

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

July 7, 1981

O.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
.L. 81-46	100 Virginia Avenue, S.E. D.C. Government	Rehabilitation of Garfield Park to include moving location of childrens play area, new tennis courts, remove old comfort station, landscaping and paving. All work as indicated on drawings.

CTION: Issue permit.

.L. 81-47	215 3rd Street, S.E. Robert Wilmer	Install new non-combustible aluminum siding over old corrugated metal siding on garage. 6" wide overlapped aluminum (white) siding. Would paint if necessary to match landscaping.

CTION: Issue permit.

.L. 81-48	500 C Street, S.W. Home Federal Savings	Install two signs between columns in arcade area.

CTION: Issue permit for signs between columns in arcade area.

.L. 81-49	500 C Street, S.W. 500 C Street Associates	New signs for Holiday Inn.

CTION: Issue permit. No objection to excess size in context of existing building.

.L. 81-50	1620 Manchester Lane, N.W. Micheal Burack	Construct redwood deck and fence.

CTION: Issue permit for fence and deck. Finish side of fence shall face street.

.L. 81-51	600 Maryland Avenue, S.W. Ocean View Development Ltd. Partnership	5 new signs.

CTION: Issue permit for signs as submitted to include two internally illuminated signs: one 1'-6" by 15'-2 1/2" and one 1'- 6" by 20'-2 1/2", and one 217'- 7" band sign 17'- 6" above finished grade. Request each individual sign to be incorporated within the latter installation to be submitted to CFA for review of lettering styles, spacing and text.

All signs single-faced, having white acrylic letters laminated to acrylic sheet, and secured to building facade above glass windows and doors. No objection to 5'- 4" by 8"- 6" internally illuminated pylon sign having black letters laminated to translucent white acrylic sheet and erected on concrete pedestal. Request submission of paint selection for exposed aluminum.

O.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
.L. 81-54	1434 F Street, N.W. Gal-Tex Corporation	Erect awnings

CTION: Issue permit. Height of awnings to be reduced from 9'- 0" to 7'- 0".

.L. 81-57	2603 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Roj Malek	Plastic box sign

CTION: Issue permit. Request black letters only.

.L. 81-60 PA. 81-378	441 2nd Street, S.E. Brian Furness	Convert existing basement into apartment, redesign first floor, remove existing uncovered concrete from porch and steps. Replace with new brick steps and stoop. Rebuild and enlarge existing garage to rear.

CTION: Issue permit. Paint side walls of stoop to match facade of house.

.L. 81-61	2116 F Street, N.W. Leo Bernstein	Erect an awning

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 81-62	2117 E Street, N.W. Leo Bernstein	Erect an awning

ACTION: Issue permit.

S.L. 81-65	2820 Davenport Street, N.W. James Romano	Two story single family colonial dwelling

ACTION: Returned for accurate drawings depicting design in relation to topography and actual details.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

July 7, 1981

	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
G. 81-67 A. 81-182	3000 M Street, N.W. Marbury Association	Erect an awning

TION: Preliminary designs for canopy crossing sidewalk and arch topped awning not commended. Suggest box or marquee type canopy as shown on revised sketch.

G. 81-78 A. 81-227	3414 N Street, N.W. Millicent-Chattel	Application for sign

TION: Issue permit for modified design to have vertical proportion (30" high 25" wide) and bracket mounted directly from brick and in no way fastened to shutter. xisting temporary sign shall be removed. An exception allowing a projecting sign is ecommended.

.G. 81-95 PA. 81-267	3300 M Street, N.W. Meredith Corporation	New residential and commercial building

CTION: Preliminary design approved subject to submission and approval of working rawings and erection of material sample for approval on site.

.G. 81-97 PA. 81-270	3222 M Street, N.W. Georgetown Park Associates	Modification to south residential facade.

CTION: Preliminary designs approved for residential portion of Georgetown Park project. ubmit working drawings and material samples for approval prior to issuance of construction permit.

).G. 81-102, HPA. 81-277	3632 Prospect Street, N.W. Thomas Lott	Third floor renovation

ACTION: Issue permit for window changes and dormer addition as shown on modified drawings with applicant's consent. The Board recommended that flat skylights be used instead of bubble-type skylight to decrease their visibility. Also the Board recommended that the nonstandard window arch proposed for the south gable end be changed to a palladian motif more consistent with style of house.

).G. 81-106 HPA. 81-303	3631 & 3633 Canal Road, N.W. Canal Road Associates	Addition of residential and office space to existing building.

ACTION: Preliminary designs approved subject to submission and approval of working drawings and material samples prior to issuance of construction permit. Erection of a sample brick panel on the site is requested for review and approval.

).	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
.G. 81-107 ?A. 81-304	1669 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Fabrizio Jawer	Renovation of existing clapboard structure, two story brick addition.

CTION: Preliminary design for addition and alteration to existing structure is approved. equest submission of working drawings and erection of sample panel of proposed brick on ite for review prior to issuance of construction permit.

.G. 81-108 PA. 81-307	1099 30th Street, N.W. DRG Ventures	New office building, revisions to existing permit.

CTION: Issue permit for revised design. Erect brick sample on site for inspection nd approval by Commission prior to construction.

.G. 81-110 PA. 81-312	1239 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. John Olsson	Out door sign 15" x 21 1/2' brown lettering on light tan background attached to overhang.

.CTION: Issue permit for signs as shown on drawings modified with applicant's consent. ;oard recommends removal of existing signs and lowering the proposed sign so as to .eave visible the moldings of the cornice.

).G. 81-112 HPA. 81-323	3000 M Street, N.W. Marbury Associates	Erect an awning

\CTION: Superceded by O.G. 81-133.

).G. 81-113 HPA. 81-324	2918 M Street, N.W. Pierre Gaudux	Replace existing concrete steps with cast stone steps to match stone door steps.

ACTION: Issue permit for new cast stone steps.

O.G. 81-114 HPA. 81-325	1420 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Long Rap Inc.	Erect non-load bearing partition, alter existing storefront.

ACTION: Issue permit for alterations to entrance area. The facade of the building shall remain unchanged except for painting and repairs.

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 81-115 HPA. 81-330	1720 34th Street, N.W. Vivian Campbell	Remove wood framing and screening, install new framing new wood platform and stairs, white storm and screen windows, white clapboard style aluminum siding, new door.

ACTION: Issue permit for porch enclosure.

O.G. 81-117 HPA. 81-345	3251 K Street, N.W. Papermill Associates	Changes in roof and penthouses. New entrance to building.

ACTION: Do not issue permit change until further studies have been submitted and approved. Request restudy of entrance area to have front wall parallel to facades of main buildings and street. Revisions to penthouse have not been acted on pending further study of reduction in size and inspection by Board on June 9, 1981.

O.G. 81-119 HPA. 81-348	3115 O Street, N.W. Mr. & Mrs. Herman	Restore height of original entrance door, reconstruct brick entrance stair, new two story addition on rear of building.

ACTION: Issue permit for restored doorway, stoop and rear addition. Paint brick stoop sidewalls to match adjacent brick.

O.G. 81-119 HPA. 81-355	1517 30th Street, N.W. Dodge House Associates	Restored porches - structural framing only

ACTION: Superceded by O.G. 81-122.

O.G. 81-120 HPA. 81-357	3200 S Street, N.W. Catherine Carruthers	Change roof revision from permit#B280900 and B280899 as per revised plans and balcony overhang.

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 81-121 HPA. 81-358	3251 K Street, N.W. Papermill Associates	Preliminary review of expansion of elevator tower, new entrance on K Street side, revision to permit B281739 as per attached plans.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Excessive height and bulk of consolidated penthouse as proposed would have an adverse effect on this historic pair of buildings and the historic district. Architect has agreed to restudy.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN BOARD

July 7, 1981

NO.	ADDRESS AND OWNER	PROJECT
O.G. 81-122 HPA. 81-359	1517 30th Street, N.W. Dodge House Associates	Renovation of an existing 21 unit apartment house to 26 unit apartment house as per plans.

ACTION: Issue permit for renovation according to revised plans submitted to the Commission on 6/11/81. Note corrections on sheets: FA-15 and FA-17.

O.G. 81-123 HPA. 81-362	3214-3218 M Street, N.W. Germar Inc.	Canopy awning to be hung over entrance of restaurant.

ACTION: Do not issue permit. Proposed canopy is out of character with this building, does not relate to existing architectural trim and would have an adverse effect on the building.

O.G. 81-126 HPA. 81-382	3222 Scott Place, N.W. Anne Sheffield	Renovate kitchen, replace existing door with new window.

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 81-127 HPA. 81-379	2928 P Street, N.W. Sander Vanocur	To perform exterior work as per plans; including site work, window opening and vent penetration infill.

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 81-128 HPA. 81-380	3251 K Street, N.W. Papermill Associates	Construction of additional elevator banks and roof top machine room, penthouse revision and modification of cooling tower.

ACTION: Issue permit for new penthouse structures not to exceed elevation 117.5 feet or 12' - 0" above finished roof. No objection to elimination of connecting wall between penthouses.

O.G. 81-131 HPA. 81-385	1500 35th Street, N.W. Georgetown Visitation School	Renovation of four stairways for classification of a fire egress.

ACTION: Issue permit.

O.G. 81-132 HPA. 81-386	1601 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Gulf Oil Company	Install new signs for Gulf gasoline station.

ACTION: Hold for conference with owner.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

7 July 1981

The meeting was convened at 10:00 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members Present:	Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman Hon. Sondra G. Myers Hon. Walter A. Netsch Hon. Alan R. Novak
Staff Present:	Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary Mr. Jeffrey R. Carson Mrs. Sue Kohler Mr. Richard Ryan
National Capital Planning Commission Staff Present:	Mr. George Evans

I. SITE INSPECTION (9:00 a.m., prior to meeting)

a. Proposed Apartment House - 24th and Virginia Avenue

b. Vietnam Veterans Memorial; site inspection, Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, N. W.

c. Old Post Office; site inspection, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.

d. Marriott/Quadrangle brick sample inspection, 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. (S.L. 81-18) Square 254.

e. Shopfront signs - 1301 E Street, N. W.

II. ADMINISTRATION

A. Minutes of meeting of 12 May 1981; approved.

B. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 16 September 1981 (Wednesday)
13 October 1981

C. Public hearing on Georgetown Harbour Associates project at 3020 K Street, N. W. (O.G. 81-87, HAP 81-244); report. The Secretary said it was inappropriate to comment at this time as the hearing was still in progress. He added that the Chairman's statement, read at the hearing, and any other pertinent documents would be appended to these minutes. Exhibit 1.

III. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. National Park Service, National Capital Region

1. CFA 7/JUL/81-1, Vietnam Veterans Memorial; preliminary design review; Constitution Avenue and Henry Bacon Drive, N. W. The members had seen the site during their pre-meeting tour; the Assistant Secretary noted for the record that the memorial would be located on a site between the Lincoln Memorial and Constitution Gardens and that it had been authorized by S. J. Res. 119, 96th Congress. He introduced attorney Robert Doubek, project director of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, who discussed the organization and work of the Fund. It was described as a non-profit, charitable foundation, established in 1979 by Jan C. Scruggs, a Vietnam veteran from Columbia, Maryland. Mr. Doubek said the sole purpose of the Fund was to establish a national memorial to the veterans and dead of the Vietnam War; after accomplishing this goal it would be dissolved. He said the Fund was largely staffed and directed by Vietnam veterans, including himself and professional advisers in the fields of engineering and real estate development. Mr. Doubek stressed that the purpose of the memorial was to acknowledge and recognize the sacrifices of all those who served and died in the war; it would make no statement as to whether the United States' involvement in the war was right or wrong.

Architect Paul Spreiregen was the next speaker; he had been the professional adviser for the competition to choose the design for the memorial. He said it had been felt that the question of a Vietnam memorial was one which needed to be addressed by all Americans; thus the competition had been open to all adult citizens. He said the jury had been instructed to ask two questions as it considered each entry:

1. Was it appropriate for the site? Mr. Speiregen noted here that it was considered important that the dominance of both the Washington and Lincoln memorials, in the same area, not be challenged.

2. What kind of memorial would be appropriate for this occasion? Mr. Spreiregen explained that consideration had to be given to the fact that it was a memorial to servicemen and women in a war that was lost,

and a war for a cause that will remain a question. He said the jury had decided that any symbol would be inappropriate for this kind of memorial.

The winning entry was the work of Maya Lin, a senior at Yale University majoring in architecture. She was present at the meeting, and at this point was introduced to read a statement explaining her approach to the design and what she hoped it would accomplish. She described the composition as "a rift in the earth...a long, polished black stone wall, emerging from and receding into the earth." The names of 57,692 Vietnam dead as well as those missing would be carved into this wall. Exhibit A

Before the members considered the design, they listened to Scott Brewer read a statement criticizing the design as being hazardous, having drainage problems and being inaccessible to the handicapped, as well as being inappropriate because of its minimalistic nature and lack of nobility. Miss Lin said the hazard of someone falling over the edge of the wall (ten feet at its highest point) would be minimized by the use of a "ha-ha" or a similar natural barrier. Handicapped access down the gentle slope would be facilitated by means of a path, if the grass proved unsuitable for that kind of traffic. Mr. Doubek said drainage questions had already been investigated and were not considered a problem. Mr. Netsch noted that wheelchair access was a problem, but thought it could be solved; he suggested that the Commission participate in finding the solution. As to the appropriateness of the design, Mr. Netsch said there always had been and would be multiple opinions on memorials; his personal opinion was that this design was very effective and not minimal. He pointed out the "quiet symbolism" of the recall of the PFC stripe in the shape of the intersecting walls, a recognition of the importance of the foot soldier in the Vietnam War. He felt the design was at once modest and impressive, noting the ambience created between the observer and nature. Mrs. Myers and Mr. Novak also commented on the appropriateness of the design. The Chairman summarized the discussion, pointing out the importance of the site, and that the design was in fact characterized by nobility in its quiet strength and in its siting between two of the nation's greatest memorials.

The preliminary design was unanimously approved, with further details and materials to be reviewed at a later date. Exhibits A-1, A-2

B. General Services Administration

1. CFA 7/JUL/81-2, Old Post Office renovation; final landscaping and paving plan, 12th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W.
The Commission had seen this site on their pre-meeting tour, and the Assistant Secretary began his presentation by reviewing for them the plans for the surrounding area: the finishing of the uncompleted ends of the IRS building, the development of the atrium between it and the old Post Office, and the special paving for the hemicycle along Twelfth Street. He noted that this master plan study had been instigated by the Commission, which had urged cooperation between the architect who developed the master plan (Harry Weese and Associates)

and Arthur Cotton Moore, the architect for the renovation of the Old Post Office. He said such cooperation had taken place and was reflected in the designs before the Commission at this meeting.

Robert Schriever from GSA was introduced and reported on progress made thus far on the Old Post Office renovation. He said the interior work was ninety-five percent complete, and there was money available to complete the exterior site work. Architect Arthur Cotton Moore was introduced and in turn presented his associate, Robert Hammell. Mr. Hammell and Mr. Moore then discussed what would be essentially a temporary solution to providing access to retail functions in the Old Post Office building. Mr. Moore explained that these plans would in no way impact the implementation of the master plan for that area. He noted that he had coordinated these developments with PADC as well as GSA, and the PADC pavers would be used for entrances off Twelfth Street as well as the avenue. A paved rectilinear space off Pennsylvania Avenue between the Post Office and the IRS building would provide access into the Post Office and allow its retail function to spread outside. It would be bordered with trees and shrubs. A gently ramped entrance off Twelfth Street would provide entrance into the rear of the Old Post Office. One lane of this would be for vehicles and would lead to a temporary service area and loading dock on the east side of the Post Office. The area would be screened by trees. The Chairman pointed out that, as designed, the focus seemed to be on this narrow entrance and through into the service; he thought that if trees in tubs were placed in the right lication, a baffle could be created to help screen off the parking beyond. Mr. Netsch suggested a location for such a baffle on the curved part of the entrance ramp. All agreed this was a good suggestion. There were no objections and the plans were approved.

Exhibit B

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 7/JUL/81-3, Intersection of Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue, restudy of curb alignment and preliminary designs. The Secretary reviewed the scheme previously submitted (May 1981) and noted the members' concern about the geometry of the accesses through this awkward space, the tendency of the design to obscure the Constitution Avenue vista, and certain landscaping features. He said several meetings with PADC and NCPC staff members had taken place since that time, resulting in the new plan presented at this meeting. Tom Regan of PADC discussed the design, noting first the large size of this space--about 900 feet long and 400 feet deep. He said there had been three goals in this revised design: to maintain both the Pennsylvania Avenue and Constitution Avenue vistas; to enhance the Mellon Fountain; and to improve traffic safety. He noted on the drawings that the "dog-legs" providing access had been moved to help accomplish these goals. The moving of the one to the south would also make possible a seating area across from the National Gallery's west building. The dog-leg to the north had been moved west, that to the south moved east. The willow oaks on Constitution Avenue had been removed and elms, traditional along this avenue, substituted so as to strengthen the vista. The elms surrounding the Mellon Fountain would remain and a

single row of willow oaks would be carried along Pennsylvania Avenue to strengthen that vista. Mr. Regan said he hoped better planting could be provided at the end of the Federal Trade Commission building across Sixth Street, both to improve the building and act as a backdrop to the Mellon Fountain. The triangular space southeast of the Mellon Fountain, shown as a site for sculpture in the former plan, would now hold flagpoles on which could be displayed banners, perhaps announcing National Gallery of Art exhibitions. The pumping station site, originally shown with fifty-three flagpoles, was simply planted with trees in this scheme. A new element was the placing of the General Meade statue (removed some time ago from its original site west of the Capitol) south of the U. S. District Court, on the centerline of the entrance. Mr. Regan then noted that the PADC decorative lights would continue along the avenue in this location, and the high mast lights placed so as to avoid the centerline of Constitution Avenue.

The Chairman was concerned that the narrowing of Sixth Street as shown on the drawings would impinge upon the vista down that street to the National Gallery, throwing it out of symmetry. Mr. Regan agreed that it would, adding that the recommendation had been made recently to move the east curb back five feet to solve this problem. pending the possibility of closing this small bit of 6th street altogether. The Chairman had some reservations about the sculptural quality of the Meade statue. He also pointed out the proposed relocation of the service drive to the National Gallery's West building, creating a new curb cut on 4th street and an axial vista straight through into the service yard. Mr. Netsch suggested that no Commission approval be given to the new service drive design until officials at the National Gallery were satisfied that the service arrangements would function in practical terms. The Commission members otherwise considered the new design a great improvement, and approved the concept unanimously, with the above noted reservations.

At this point Mr. Regan asked if he could get approvel for the temporary installation of a Victorian bandstand, a gift to PADC, on the old Kann's Department Store site. He said the bandstand would eventually have a permanent location in the Market Square park area. There were no objections to this temporary installation.

Exhibit C, C-1

D. Smithsonian Institution

1. CFA 7/JUL/81-4, Renwick Gallery; reserfacing of ornamental stonework. 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Staff member Jeffrey Carson reviewed the Commission's inspection, in October 1980, of samples of architectural concrete ornamentation proposed as a replacement for the deteriorating sandstone. The Commission had recommended earlier (8 January 1980) that the Smithsonian investigate sources of natural sandstone for replacement, feeling that stone would be far better than concrete, even though the latter might have some weathering advantages. Mr. Carson said these investigations had been made and further tests conducted on the architectural concrete. He introduced Thomas Peyton from the Smithsonian to give the members a

report on the results. Mr. Peyton first reviewed the history of the building for the new members, citing the poor quality of the original sandstone, the repairs required in 1903, and the major restoration carried out in 1965, when the Smithsonian acquired the building. He said the decorative elements had been repaired with a substance consisting of a cellulose nitrate polymer mixed with ground sandstone, and it had not been successful. It was then decided to replace all the sandstone, since eighty percent of it was beyond repair. Inquiries were made into procuring American sandstone and also into using a cast architectural concrete which could duplicate the appearance of the stone and weather better. Efforts to procure a suitable stone in this country failed, and at the Commission's suggestion German and Engligh varieties had been obtained and subjected to weathering tests to determine color stability and durability. These had disclosed fading and inconsistency in color and poor resistance to acid fumes. Tests and experiments with the architectural concrete continued, with the addition of a dark aggregate achieving better color and latex moulds providing better reproduction of small details. It was determined that salts leeching from the soft, salmon brick into the original sandstone, butted directly against it, had hastened the deterioration. The new ornament will be placed a small distance away from the brick. Mr. Peyton said a panel of experts, both architectural historians and scientists, had reviewed the results of all the tests and come to the conclusion that the concrete would be a better choice than the sandstone. The members were reluctant to approve anything but natural stone, and Mr. Netsch asked if one of the German stones would not be satisfactory if kept from direct contact with the brick. Chemist Seymour Lewin, who has been conducting the tests for the Smithsonian, said the uneven coloring and poor resistance to acids would still make the stone an unwise choice. The Chairman said he realized a great deal of effort had gone into these investigations and tests, and the Commission would be willing to accept the Smithsonian's recommendations. However, he asked that great care be taken in producing the original plaster moulds to be sure that the detail was exceptionally crisp, so that the final result from the latex moulds would not have a soft, rubbery look. On that basis, the members unanimously approved the use of architectural concrete.

Exhibit D

E. District of Columbia, Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 81-52, 601 24th Street, N. W. Preliminary design; new apartment building. Mr. Carson described the site for this proposed 104 foot high apartment building, pointing out that it would be on a visual axis with the Watergate and the Washington Monument. He introduced Paul Merrick from the architectural firm of Bucher-Meyers, who showed the members a rendering of the structure. He said they had attempted to make the building distinctive through the use of a high sloped roof and the use of tinted glass on the balconies. The building would be tan brick with a dark brown roof. The Chairman said the roof was a surprising element, one more characteristic of domestic, small-scale structures. Mr. Netsch thought it would compete with the historic

buildings in the area and also with the view. When asked if there was a functional reason for such a large roof Mr. Merrick replied there was not. He was asked to change the roof treatment to one not so conspicious and resubmit his project. The design was unanimously disapproved.

b. S.L. 81-53, 2112 F Street, N. W. Revised preliminary designs; new apartment building. Mr. Carson told the members that this submission was for redesign of a project given preliminary approval in October 1980. The ninety foot high building, with a clinic on the ground floor and apartments above, would now have a different facade from the one previously approved. The semi-circular eight story portico and adjacent eight story bow had been eliminated and some changes made to the entrance also. Architect Arthur Cotton Moore was introduced and showed drawings of the new design, which featured an undulating glass curtain wall on the facade. He compared this with the drawing of the original version, pointing out the changes. He then showed photographs of other simple yellow brick buildings in the immediate area and said he planned to use a light-colored stone for this building, probably granite, which would be submitted later. The members agreed that the revised design was an improvement and approved it unanimously.

c. S.L. 81-55, 655 15th Street, N. W. Final working drawings for office/retail complex. Mr. Carson said this submission consisted of final working drawings for Phase I of this project, which would include the Keith-Albee building and the office building along G Street. He showed slides of drawings for this section, for the benefit of the new members, and said there would be little visual change to the historic Keith-Albee building; play-bill niches associated with the old theatre would be removed and some modifications made to the entrance. Railings on the new building had also been simplified since the members had last seen them. Architect Vlastimil Koubek, associated with Skidmore, Owings, & Merrill on this project, described the materials: precast concrete, simulating limestone, for the new building; solar bronze, non-reflecting glass set in dark aluminum frames for the windows, and a Hastings block, coordinated with PADC, for the paving. He pointed out also the total restoration of the exterior of the first floor of the Keith-Albee building. Satisfied from the staff report that the working drawings conformed to the preliminaries, the members unanimously approved them.

d. S.L. 81-56, 2613 Klingle Road, N. W. Preliminary design for new residence. The Assistant Secretary noted that the Commission had reviewed an adjacent house and said this project would be constructed of similar materials: vertical, natural finish wood siding with a cedar shake roof. However, this house, sited on a steep slope, would be built on stilts. Architect Robert Schwartz was introduced to answer the members' questions. Mr. Schwartz was asked about the appearance of the ground underneath the structure and how the underside of the house would look from the street below. There was also a general concern as to how a house of this type would fit into the park setting and how it would relate to other houses in the area. Mr. Schwartz said he would disturb the earth as little as possible while preparing the foundation for the stilts and hoped that the vegetation now existing

would continue to grow. He said a soffit, painted dark brown, would cover all utility lines, etc., beneath the house. It was suggested that some kind of trellising be used to screen the area under the stilts, however, both to soften the effect from the street and to cover what would probably be bare ground, the area being too dark to insure the growth of much vegetation. The Chairman and Mr. Netsch again expressed their concern about making this structure compatible with its surroundings. Mr. Schwartz asked if he could substitute another roofing material for the cedar shakes because of the cost. This was not considered a good idea, and Mrs. Myers commented that it would be a difficult request to grant because other applicants in the area had been required to use this type of roofing. The project was not approved and Mr. Schwartz was asked to restudy his design with a view to making it more compatible with its surroundings.

e. S.L.81-59, 1301 E Street, N. W. Proposed signs for new office building. The Secretary reported that these signs, for stores in one of the new buildings facing Pennsylvania Avenue, would be made of Duranodic aluminum with white Plexiglas letters, illuminated from behind. It was explained that the proposed translucent letter-faces constituted a departure from existing sign regulations. Because E Street is essentially a commercial street and the signs would not front directly on Pennsylvania Avenue, there were no objections, providing the letters were no higher than twelve inches, and the intensity of the lighting kept relatively low and equal for all the signs.

f. S.L. 81-63, 55 Ivy Street, S. E. Working drawings, new office building. Mr. Carson said this design had been given preliminary approval and was being submitted for approval of working drawings. He noted, however, that some changes had been made in the fenestration of the east elevation following suggestions made by the Commission. The building will face a row of small townhouses and it was suggested that the horizontal strip windows be broken up to reduce the scale and lessen the impact on the houses. Roger Strassman of Weihe, Black, Jeffries, Strassman and Dove showed the new drawings, pointing out the fenestration and also the addition of balconies to suggest a more residential character. He said paving in front of the building would be brick and would be carried all the way to New Jersey Avenue, other property owners having agreed. The members thought the new facade design carried out the Commission's recommendation, and the final working drawings were approved.

g. S.L. 81-66, 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W., Preliminary design and material selection. Staff member Richard Ryan said this submission was for material samples and color selection and recalled that the building design had received preliminary approval in July 1980. When the material and color samples had been presented in January 1981, there had been serious concern about the choice of an almost black glazed brick for the Pennsylvania Avenue and Fourteenth Street facades. Slides were shown of the original rendering of the Pennsylvania Avenue facade and the original dark brick sample, as well as the blue brick and red tile to be used for decorative accents on

the Pennsylvania Avenue facade. The members had seen four panel samples of brick on the site, in varying shades of grey, when they made their pre-meeting tour.

Allan Greenberger, from the firm of Mitchell/Giurgola, and Frank Schlesinger, associated architect, were both introduced. Mr. Schlesinger showed a new rendering of the Pennsylvania Avenue facade, pointing out some areas of simplification, and then discussed the brick samples. He said he found the lighter samples bland and insipid. Mr. Netsch said he still had difficulties with dark brick, and with the marked variation among the various elevations. He thought that if it were to be a "non-building", with a different architectural treatment relating to its neighbors on every side, then dark brick would not be a good choice. The Chairman commented on the difference of the samples examined in sunlight from the bricks seen indoors at the last meeting, which had appeared darker, and stressed the desirability of keeping the warmth of the background, which some of the bricks had exhibited in the field, and which related better to the surrounding buildings. He said some degree of darkness might keep the large building from "floating away", and from being too bland, and would give a brick building a greater degree of formality. The key would be that it not be too dark and contrasting. After checking with the members, the Chairman said that the consensus was that the ideal might be between the two darker samples as seen on the site. Mr. Greenberger showed elevation drawings of the Pennsylvania Avenue facade, pointing out the decorative blue color accents along the top and the green granite piers at the ground floor level, with white trim and a decorative accent of square red tiles on each one. It was generally agreed that this ground floor decoration could use more study to make it really effective. It was requested that a model of a section of the ground floor arcade be submitted to clarify the decorative treatment of the interior surfaces. It was also agreed that a larger panel of the brick be erected,with the color and value of the brick falling between the two darker panels inspected earlier that day.

h. Appendix 1, approved.

2. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 81-129, 1732 Wisconsin Avenue, N. W.; raze retail building. Mr. Ryan showed photographs of this twentieth century, two-story retail building with an addition along the front. He then showed a drawing of the row of buildings on this block, with a proposed new building on the site of the one to be razed. The new building had a steep, sloping roof rising well above the other buildings. He said the Georgetown Board had considered this project and had no objection to the razing, unless further research disclosed some compelling reason for its retention. They did, however, have some suggestions about the proposed replacement. The architect, Luther Blair, was then introduced. He said the new building would incorporate two floors of retail space with two levels of residential above,in the sloped roof section. A parapet above the second floor would screen the residential from the

street. The members all thought the high, sloping roof not appropriate to the historic district. It was suggested that Mr. Blair restudy the design and resubmit it to the Georgetown Board, possibly setting the residential far back from the street with a terrace in front. In the meantime, more research would be completed on the building proposed for razing. The razing was not approved.

b. O.G. 81-133, 3000 M Street, N. W., canopy designs. The Assistant Secretary showed two renderings of the facade of this building, one with a curved and the other with a triangular shaped awning over one of the arcade arches. He said the original proposal was for a large canopy covering the entire sidewalk. The Georgetown Board had objected to anything projecting from the arcade and to the awkward relation of any awning due to the disparity of the relatively low open arch and the higher required clearance of the awning. The Commission agreed, with the Chairman noting that the purpose of the arcade itself was to offer weather protection and nothing more was needed.

c. Appendix 2, approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Signed,

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED · BY · CONGRESS · MAY · 17, 1910

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

STATEMENT OF J. CARTER BROWN, CHAIRMAN
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS, PUBLIC HEARING,
HPA 81-244, 3020 K STREET, N. W.,
JUNE 29, 1981

The Commission of Fine Arts has advised against the issuance of a permit for Georgetown Harbour Associates' large scale, mixed use project at 3020 K Street, N. W., because a project of this size and mass, located directly on the Georgetown waterfront, would be incompatible with the historic district.

The disapproval was not based on the quality of the architectural design; rather, it was based on the recognition that even a well-designed building, on the wrong site, must be considered unacceptable. This is particularly true when the site is within a historic district, and even more critical when it is also directly on the Potomac River, with its major scenic and historic importance for the Nation's Capital. Further, the site in question is bordered by Rock Creek and its adjacent park land to the east, and to the west by District Government land, which the Mayor has designated for park use. Thus isolated, it would be highly visible as the only large-scale development on the entire waterfront area of the historic district. Its adverse impact on the historic character of Georgetown would be unacceptable.

The Commission feels strongly that this land should be developed in a manner consistent with open recreational use and compatible in character with adjoining public park lands to the east and south of the site. This area adjoins a virtually unbroken necklace of green edge to the Potomac from Great Falls to Mount Vernon. Specific mention was made of such facilities as restaurants, boat houses and the like, and logically those ideas could be expanded to include marina facilities, refreshment kiosks and similarly related recreational activities. It is one of the most beautiful sites on the Potomac; here the river bends and views can be had both up and down stream, as well as over to the wooded shores of Theodore Roosevelt Island.

Exhibit 1

The Commission does not envision this area of the Potomac waterfront as a literal extension of public park land such as East and West Potomac parks. Instead it should be a lively and attractive place for people, with its own distinctive character setting it apart from other waterfront parks. This concept, however, is not supported by the intensive, large scale commercial, office and residential development as proposed by Georgetown Harbour Associates.

Some comment should be made here on the amount of open space this development would provide. The developer has stated that "fifteen acres of parkland" would be made available to the public if his three acres of development were allowed. Much of this land is, in fact, not privately owned but already in the public domain. The "Mole" area, for example, would revert to the Federal Government when current railroad use ceases. The land immediately west of the site, of course, is currently owned by the District Government, as is the rest of the waterfront to Key Bridge, having been purchased by "ninety-ten" Federal highway funds for a freeway. Yet the impression given in the developer's landscape drawings and plans and in newspaper articles and editorials is that the remainder of the Georgetown waterfront would become a park if the "three" acres of development were allowed to proceed. This is misleading. Although the developer has offered to landscape some of the property, it should be noted that this would be to his financial benefit and actually necessary to provide a setting for his development. At no point in the Commission's records, incidentally, is there ever a commitment by the developer to absorb the cost of relocating current District uses of land immediately west of Thirty-first Street, costs that would have to be met by the expenditure of public funds. It should be noted, too, that no substantial benefit will be received from the improvement and maintenance of the rights-of-way of Virginia Avenue and Thirtieth Street as open space since they, too, are in the public domain. Further, the project could not function without them; they are necessary for access to shops and entrances to buildings, and below grade they would be used for private parking.

Finally, it is questionable whether a project of this size should be built on the Potomac floodplain. The question of the compatibility of the project with the river's floodplain is, of course, outside the technical expertise of the Commission. When the floodplain issue was raised before the Commission, we sought the advice of the Department of Justice whether the Commission is bound by Executive Order No.11988, dealing with floodplain management and the responsibilities of Federal agencies in this area. On being advised that we are, we considered the floodplain issue at our March 10 and April 7, 1981 hearings. Although, as we were required to do, we studied the issue, whether the project should be permitted in the Potomac floodplain was not a determinative consideration for the Commission. The Commission's principal objection to the Georgetown Harbor Associates' proposal (and the basis of its negative recommendation) has been and remains the project's density and mass, which are not compatible with historic Georgetown and its waterfront.

Because of the importance of the floodplain issue, the Commission recommends that the District Government, to the extent permitted by law, give it serious consideration.

The Commission reviewed the project at six public meetings: 11 December 1979, 11 March 1980, 8 April 1980, 7 October 1980, 10 March 1981 and 7 April 1981. At each of these meetings extensive testimony was heard, pro and con, from all concerned including the developer, interested citizens, and representatives from civic and environmental groups. The design submitted in December 1979 was rejected because of its excessive mass and bulk and considered totally incompatible with the historic town and the park-like character of the rest of the Potomac shoreline. The developer returned with a new design by a different architect in March 1980. Reduced in bulk and characterized by a more open site plan, it was considered a significant improvement, though still excessively high and massive. It was subsequently reduced in size and reviewed again in April 1980.

At this point the reason for the Commission's continuing review of this project should be made clear. Each time it was submitted the Commission prefaced the discussion by stating its preference for an open, park-like scheme with only minimal development. The continued interest in commenting on the actual design was done with one purpose in mind; that in the event such a large scale project was to move ahead for one reason or another over the Commission's objections, at least the quality of the architecture would be the best possible under the circumstances. It should not be construed that the Commission was giving its tacit approval to the project by agreeing to carry forward the process of design review.

On March 10, 1981, the final plans for this development were submitted, although for technicalities involving zoning, no permit approval was requested. During the course of the hearing, however, the developer indicated that he would like to have a decision. The Commission thought it only fair that a final recommendation should be made at this time, and after considering its position voted against issuance of a permit. On 7 April 1981, the zoning technicalities having been resolved, the developer again came before the Commission, this time formally requesting approval for permit application. The Commission listened to his further testimony, and to comments by citizens favoring the development. This was followed by extensive testimony by those opposed. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Commission considered its position once more, and through a polling of the members, the March recommendation against issuing a permit was reconfirmed.

Open space, particularly along the waterfronts of our cities, is becoming increasingly important to maintain as our urban population expands and the need for recreation facilities close to home increases. Admittedly, the Georgetown waterfront is an eyesore and has been for some time. It is tempting, particularly in this time of

economic difficulty, to accept this compromise with its several attractive aspects and say that it is the best we can hope for in the near future. But for those charged with preserving the historic and visual aspects of this National Capital, long range considerations must take precedence. Achieving the best possible development of an important site often required patience--the Mall is a good example of this.

The Commission of Fine Arts, established by Congress in 1910 to implement the plans of the Senate Park Commission of 1901, has had long years of experience considering plans for the Capital's parks and waterways. Under the Shipstead-Luce Act it has, since 1930, reviewed plans for private structures visible from Rock Creek Park to determine their compatibility. For the past thirty years it has been charged, under the Old Georgetown Act, with preserving the character of this historic district. During the last decade the Commission has approved a large amount of new construction in the historic district. When all projects now under construction open up we may find that the point has already been reached beyond which the addition of any large scale development will mean that the historic character of Georgetown as a low density, human scale, Federal-period town cannot survive. With these considerations in mind the Commission of Fine Arts conscientiously reviewed this project, while making it clear to the developer at the onset that it strongly recommended only recreational use for this important site. The Commission has consistently judged that the size and scale of the project were incompatible with the historic district and waterfront. Once built, its impact would be irreversible.

VMF NEWS

ETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL FUND

CPA

Jr. Esq.*
II, Esq.*

ISORING

erbach
rporation

r

ia

Latin
/LULAC

h Bunker

land*
Corrada
ioner
the

or
avison USA Ret.*
f-in-Chief

R Ford

tor

Hesburgh, C.S.C.
e Dame

es*
iefs of Staff
Jr.
ague
McGovern

im of the U.S.

ckdale, USN Ret.*

itor

Fire
Westmoreland Ret.*
taff U.S. Army

s
tion
tion

ssociation
tes
sioned
on of
of America
Association
tes
gn Wars

an

dentification only

STAFF

Ian Craig Scruggs*
President

Col. Donald E. Schaet, USMC, Ret.*
Executive Vice President

Robert W. Doubek, Esq.*
Project Director, Secretary

Sandie Fauriol
Campaign Director

DESIGN COMPETITION: WINNING DESIGNER'S STATEMENT

Walking through this park-like area, the memorial appears as a rift in the earth -- a long, polished black stone wall, emerging from and receding into the earth. Approaching the memorial, the ground slopes gently downward and the low walls emerging on either side, growing out of the earth, extend and converge at a point below and ahead. Walking into the grassy site contained by the walls of the memorial we can barely make out the carved names upon the memorial walls. These names, seemingly infinite in number, convey the sense of overwhelming numbers, while unifying those individuals into a whole. For this memorial is meant not as a memorial to the individual, but rather as a memorial to the men and women who died during the war, as a whole.

The memorial is composed not as an unchanging monument, but as a moving composition, to be understood as we move into and out of it; the passage itself is gradual, the descent to the origin slow, but it is at the origin that the meaning of this memorial is to be fully understood. At the intersection of these walls, on the right side, at the wall's top, is carved the date of the first death. It is followed by the names of those who have died in the war, in chronological order. These names continue on this wall, appearing to recede into the earth at the wall's end. The names resume on the left wall, as the wall emerges from the earth, back to the origin, where the date of the last death is carved, at the bottom of this wall. Thus the war's beginning and end meet; the war is 'complete', coming full circle, yet broken by the earth that bounds the angle's open side, and contained within the earth itself. As we turn to leave, we see these walls stretching into the distance, directing us to the Washington Monument, to the left, and the Lincoln Memorial, to the right, thus bringing the Vietnam memorial into historical context. We the living are brought to a concrete realization of these deaths.

Brought to a sharp awareness of such a loss, it is up to each individual to resolve or come to terms with this loss. For death is in the end a personal and private matter and the area contained within this memorial is a quiet place, meant for personal reflection and

-more-

Exhibit A

private reckoning. The thick granite walls, each 200 feet long and 10 feet below the ground at their lowest point (gradually ascending toward ground level) effectively act as a sound barrier, yet are of such a height and length so as not to appear threatening or enclosing. The actual area is wide and shallow, allowing for a sense of privacy, and the sunlight from the memorial's southern exposure along with the grassy park surrounding and within its wall, contribute to the serenity of the area. Thus this memorial is for those who have died, and for us to remember them.

The memorial's origin is located approximately at the center of this site; its legs each extending 200 feet toward the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial. The walls, contained on one side by the earth, are 10 feet below the ground at their point of origin, gradually lessening in height, until they finally recede totally into the earth at their ends. The walls are to be made of a hard, polished black granite, with the names to be carried by a simple Trajan letter, 3/4" high, allowing nine inches in length for each name. The memorial's construction involves recontouring the area within the wall's boundaries so as to provide for an easily accessible descent, but as much of the site as possible should be left untouched (including trees.) The area should be made into a park for all to enjoy.

--Maya Ying Lin

# # #

STATEMENT DELIVERED BEFORE THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
ON JULY 7, 1981, IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Good morning. My name is Scott Brewer, I am a Vietnam Veteran.

There is no doubt that a memorial to honor those who served in the Vietnam War, and particularly those who died and were injured, is needed, and indeed is long overdue. I strongly support the project to the extent that an appropriate design is adopted and followed through to completion. I do not support the project with the design recently selected by the jury as the design for the memorial, and feel that of the 1420 entries, the selected design least accomplishes the intent of honoring those who served, and again, particularly those Americans who died and were injured.

I see a vital role for the Commission of Fine Arts in this project, in that there is little Federal involvement in what is largely a private effort by well intended but inexperienced individuals, inexperienced in the ways of establishing a memorial to our country's war dead.

The only objective accomplished is that the design is harmonious with the site in that it does not disrupt or conflict with either the Washington Monument or the Lincoln Memorial. There are several problems however: 1) it does pose a hazard due to the submerged elevation, and barriers will be needed to prevent injury, which will themselves interfere with the design; 2) it is not easily accessible to the handicapped; 3) drainage will be a constant problem, again due to the submerged elevation of the design; but most important, the minimalist design accomplishes little. I find it to be abstract, anonymous, inconspicuous and meaningless, and is so unfullfilling as a lasting memorial that no memorial would be a better alternative. The second place entry, however does express honor and dignity and is identified as a memorial to those who served and died in the Vietnam War. And there were many others that would properly honor the Vietnam Veterans, including the third place entry and numerous honorable mention entries, all of which were on display at Andrews Air Force Base in early May.

Every prior attempt to honor the Vietnam Veterans has

been a rather weak and embarrassing gesture. Unless this project can effectively honor the Vietnam Veterans with dignity, it is hoped that a further minimal acknowledgement of service will not result.

The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund has stressed that the memorial is not to be political, that its purpose is to honor the service and memory of the war's dead, its missing and its veterans, not the war itself. Therefore, we should remove any current thoughts on the nature of the war, its conduct or results, and honor those who died, and do so in a manner that conveys full honor, dignity and respect.

It is notable that the Americans were the first to build a Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, to honor our unidentifiable or missing war dead, following the Civil War. Many other nations have followed our practice, and some of our European allies have a seperate memorial for the dead of both World Wars I and II. I think of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier of World War I in England, The Great War as the Europeans refer to it, as one example of the manner in which a grateful nation has honored its war dead. It is located in Westminster Abbey, which is the burial place of England's

Kings, Queens, political leaders and other notable citizens who have served England well. Statistically, the unknown soldier buried there was probably a 19 year old uneducated private, but they buried him in the center of Westminster Abbey among ten centuries of English royalty, and the inscription reads: " He fought and died for England and we buried him among the Kings." That effectively expresses the profound respect and appreciation of a grateful nation.

We can seperate current thoughts on the validity of the war from those who served and died, and honor them as heroes, which they were, having paid the last full measure of devotion. To honor them in a less noble manner, in line with the current thinking on the Vietnam War as one to be forgotten, is a disservice to those dead Americans who served with honor because they thought it their duty. Thank you.

Scott C. Brewer, Specialist 5th Class
Vietnamese Translator-Interpreter
3RD Radio Research Unit, U.S. Army
Saigon, S. Vietnam

1ST Detachment, 3RD Radio Research Unit
173RD Airborne Brigade
Bien Hoa, S. Vietnam 1965

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 20, 1981

Dear Jack:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered the conceptual designs for the Vietnam Veterans Memorial at its meeting on July 7, 1981. After a thorough discussion with the sponsors, their architect and the professional advisor, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the proposed memorial. In the members opinion, the design has a simplicity and sense of dignity that befits an important memorial for this site and complements the character of the park.

The Commission recognizes that this is only a conceptual design, and that there are a number of questions such as access to handicapped visitors, the possibility of a ground-water problem, and the spacing and arrangement of the names, all of which must be studied in much greater detail during design development. We strongly recommend, however, that the essential simplicity of the current design be kept as the overriding guideline in developing solutions to these possible problems.

This is especially true in introducing any devices which may be thought necessary to alerting visitors to the drop-off occurring at the points where the walls recede beneath the existing grade. There should be no obtrusive visual elements above grade in order to announce the presence of the walls. This will bear very careful study by the designer, as well as close scrutiny by the Commission. We will be glad to consider any schemes that are developed during the course of more detailed design development.

As part of this process, we would like to suggest that the locations and dimensions of the walls be accurately located and staked out on the site. Prior to our meeting, the members of the Commission approximated the layout of the memorial on the site by pacing off the dimensions. We found this very helpful, but obviously it would have been better if the actual dimensions had been laid out accurately ahead of time. I should say at this point, that while the two-hundred foot dimensions proposed for the walls appeared to be appropriate, we would strongly question any

...2/

proposal that would exceed this dimension. There simply does not appear to be sufficient room on the site for anything larger.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Manus J. Fish
Director
National Capital Region,
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 22, 1981

Dear Mr. Stewart:

The Commission of Fine Arts reviewed the site development plans for the Old Post Office at its meeting on July 7, 1981. While the design has our general concurrence, I must say that we give our final approval reluctantly in the absence of any schedule for the completion of the IRS Buildings.

As you know, the Commission believes this important restoration project will always be seriously flawed until this important phase of the work is accomplished. We were encouraged when GSA undertook a competition for a plan to finish the work at least three years ago. Harry Weese's winning design was an excellent solution, and we approved it. Then for reasons not entirely clear to us this worthwhile effort was redirected toward developing a "masterplan" for the entire Federal Triangle, including the programming of new building construction in the Great Plaza.

We certainly believe this is important, there being no greater eyesore in the entire governmental core than the present parking lot in the Plaza. However, I believe no one realistically expects to be rid of this condition in the next couple of years due to the magnitude of the cost and the present budgetary restraints throughout the federal government.

Completion of the IRS Buildings was and still is in the realm of possibility, and we believe it should receive your highest priority in planning for the Triangle the next few years. It should certainly precede the commencement of any new construction in the Plaza.

Already there are deviations from Weese's design in current plans for the site development of the Post Office. Fortunately they are not major. However, it's all too likely that unless this work and all future work is closely coordinated with that design, much that is good about it will be lost.

...2/

Exhibit B

The proposed continuation of the south-east service yard is a good example. It was to have been a landscaped court with provisions for restaurants and other attractive features planned to draw people in from Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall, a worthwhile objective. Yet this apparently will be abandoned as part of the decision to allow the IRS completion to lapse. It also means that access must be provided to the service area from 12th Street, a situation which presents a conflict between vehicular traffic and pedestrian circulation to the south side of the Old Post Office. The least that can be done now is to provide additional screening from the street, a matter that was discussed at some length at our meeting. Our approval is conditioned on the addition of a landscaped baffle to hide the entrance to the parking.

We hope this condition will be only temporary, and not in the usual sense that term connotes in Washington. The restoration of the Old Post Office has been a major federal undertaking in both expense and effort on the part of many. It would be a great shame to have its success spoiled by the indefinite continuation of the unsightly conditions of the IRS Building.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. James B. Stewart
Director
Construction Management Division
Public Building Service
General Services Administration
7th and D Streets, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20407
Room 2002

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 21, 1981

Dear Andy:

The Commission of Fine Arts was pleased to give further consideration to the Pennsylvania Avenue - Constitution Avenue intersection designs at our meeting on July 7, 1981. While we generally approve the proposed curb alignment and the simplified character of the landscaping, there are a couple of problem areas that remain.

First, as concerns the service access to the West Building of the National Gallery, the Commission is not convinced that a straight-in approach from Fourth Street is the answer. It has the obvious disadvantage of making a visual feature of the service yard and at the same time disrupting the recent landscaping framing the main pedestrian plaza on the north. I know that integrating the existing service road from Constitution Avenue with the new curb alignments has its problems too, but we would still like the opportunity to see this matter studied in much more detail before we take any final action. This would include additional re-examination of the concept of raising the triangular plaza above the grade of Constitution and the mounded seating and tree planting area, since they are obviously closely related to the solution of the service road.

Our second area of concern involves the narrowing of Sixth Street by extending the east curb line ten feet westward into the present right-of-way. The Commission feels this would be a mistake. The symmetrical view of the north entrance of the National Gallery, one of several important visual links between the downtown area and the monumental core, would be thrown out of balance. There may be some merit to closing eventually this portion of Sixth Street, and we recognize that the present island is off center and unsightly. We would have to see a specific proposal before agreeing to it. In the meantime, the existing curbs on Sixth Street should be left in their present location.

We would also like to withhold approval of the lighting scheme. The decorative lighting fixtures on both Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues are essential elements in defining their respective vistas, both during the night and the day, and we question the idea of terminating the double decorative fixtures on Constitution at the point where the Avenue is deflected over to Pennsylvania. The Commission would like to see further study of the lighting, including the retention of the existing Constitution Avenue fixtures right up to the Fourth Street intersection.

...2/

Exhibit C

The relocation of the Meade Memorial to the east of Fourth Street on the center line of the Federal Courthouse has much in its favor. The placement of a reasonably-sized focal point along the east-west axis of Constitution would help to offset the jogging effect of the new right-of-way on Constitution and could serve to reinforce the vista. We agree that a statue could be located in this view, but we would like to see more detailed study of the site before making any final determination as to the statue's precise location.

We look forward to seeing this material whenever it becomes available.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. W. Anderson Barnes
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Avenue Development
Corporation
425 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Suite 1148

Submitted July 7, 1981
Showing dwg. of bandstand
to be erected by PADC
on Kanns Dept. Store site as
a temporary structure.

Exhibit C-1

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

HAROLD BURSON
JOHN S. CHASE
SONDRA G. MYERS
WALTER A. NETSCH
ALAN R. NOVAK
EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

July 22, 1981

Dear Mr. Peyton:

It was good to have such a thorough presentation of the Renwick's stone replacement proposal at our meeting on July 7, 1981. The Renwick is one of our more important historic buildings and it deserves all the care and exhaustive study one can give it.

I am sure you understand our reluctance in approving the dyed precast concrete material as a substitute for real stone, yet as you point out, there appears to be no existing source of natural material that will ensure a first class restoration of this important structure. Since the condition of the existing stone continues to worsen, we have concluded it is important to get on with the work as you propose.

In approving the use of the precast material, I would like to emphasise the importance of quality control in maintaining a uniform color and the maximum clarity and crispness in the details of the carved stones.

The molded piece that was shown at our meeting had a distinctly bloated look. The edges lacked definition and the whole stone appeared soft and rubbery. I believe that this can be overcome by making sure the plaster cast from the first stage mold is touched up and recarved to accent the details. Otherwise much of the beauty of this type of decorative stonework will be lost if the feeling of the original material and the carving is not maintained.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Tom L. Peyton, Jr.
Director of Facilities Services
Smithsonian Institution
1000 Jefferson Drive, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20560
SI 136

Exhibit D